



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/488,971	01/21/2000	William J. Bacr	STL000015US1	5172

46159 7590 01/10/2007
SUGHRUE MION PLLC
USPTO CUSTOMER NO WITH IBM/SVL
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

BASHORE, WILLIAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/488,971	Applicant(s) BAER ET AL.	
	Examiner William L. Bashore	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/21/2006</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 10/31/2006, to the original application filed 1/21/2000. IDS filed 1/29/2004, 6/25/2004. and 12/21/2006.
2. Claims 1-27, 40-43 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ezWriter and Bromberg.
3. Claims 28-39 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ezWriter, Bromberg, and Poole.
4. Claims 1-43 pending. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, 40, 42 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2176

7. **Claims 1-27, 40-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ezWriter 2.0 for Windows (hereinafter ezWriter), August 5, 1998 by Lance Vaughn, Atlanta, IN, downloaded from <<http://www.winsite.com>> on 6/22/2003, application screenshots pages 1-15, in view of Bromberg et al. (hereinafter Bromberg), U.S. Patent No. 6,529,889 issued March 2003.**

In regard to independent claim 1, ezWriter teaches a method of reordering content in a plurality of content entities (.rtf files), stored in the ezWriter directory (a data repository, i.e. Windows Explorer accessing ezWriter's file directory of a hard drive), each entity identified by its filename and .rtf extension. Each .rtf file reflects a different section of a work (ezWriter page 3, 7, 15). The limitation of said rtf files stored as a content object would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of ezWriter, because of ezWriter's teaching of said rtf files connected via an ezWriter file (.ezw). An ezWriter file is an index of (or a set of pointers to) the saved rtf files, said ezWriter file showing the hierarchical connections to the set of files (ezWriter page 7). Since both the .ezw file ("Welcome to ezWriter.ezw") along with all referenced rtf files are stored in the same directory, this provides a reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan that this collection of files with index can be interpreted as a content object, since all associated files are grouped and associated accordingly (ezWriter page 15) (compare with claim 1 "*A method for reordering content in a content object stored as a plurality of hierarchically related content entities in a data repository, each content entity having an identifier, comprising the steps of:*"). This provides ezWriter the benefit of increased organization by combining all sections of an author's story in a single content object.

EzWriter teaches that an ezw files defines the hierarchical organization of a set of related rtf files (a plurality of content entities) (ezWriter page 8). A user can change the displayed hierarchical structure by selecting [Outline, Edit], editing the ezw file, saving said file, then refreshing the Outline (ezWriter pages 8-11). Pages 9-11 illustrate the redefining of the rtf files, subsequent to relocation of one of the files (compare with claim 1 "*defining the content object with a list of content entity identifiers such that moving a content entity*").

Art Unit: 2176

identifier to a new location within the list redefines the order of the object's content entities.”, and “A method for reordering content...”).

EzWriter does not specifically teach parent and child containers adhering to inheritance, with said containers containing content entities. However, Bromberg teaches Acappella Designer, encompassing a topic hierarchy, and a display for displaying questions, etc. related to each topic (Bromberg Abstract, column 5 lines 27-35, column 16 lines 13-18). The designer uses a process called “rollup” which the premise that each container (parent container) in the hierarchy contains information on the activity of the containers that are subordinate to it (child containers), said containers containing content (i.e. questions, etc.). Bromberg also teaches a hierarchical table (Bromberg column 18 lines 40-65, see also column 17 lines 27-40, column 19 lines 10-20 and 22-34) (compare with claim 1 “*wherein the hierarchically related content entities....can contain content entities*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bromberg to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of hierarchical containers within its set of files making set wide edits, etc. possible.

EzWriter teaches a content object (see above). Since EzWriter's .ezw file is a form of list file (listing relevant rtf files) said file stored as a “file”, EzWriter's .ezw file can be fairly interpreted as a “file object” stored in the content object (the ezWriter directory) (see EzWriter page 15). It is noted that the listed rtf files can be interpreted as content identifiers identifying each content entity. EzWriter also teaches list differentiation (parent/child entries) in the form of separation by periods, providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention of a hierarchical arrangement incorporating levels/subordinate levels (tiers), all user defined accordingly via file editing (see EzWriter page 8). (Compare with claim 1 “*wherein for the content object, storing as a file object within the data repository, the list of content entity identifiers indicating the content entities within the content object, wherein a hierarchical arrangement of the content entity identifiers within the list includes at least one hierarchical tier and at least one subordinate tier and corresponds to a user-defined content object hierarchical structure,*”). The use of the above provides the benefit of hierarchical organization to a story.

EzWriter teaches content entities (rtf files) stored within a data repository as a plurality of file objects, each object containing said content entity (the files contain content accordingly) (see EzWriter page 15). It is noted that each identifier listed in the .ezw file contains information identifying the file object (the name of each rtf file e.g. "Planned Improvements.rtf", etc.) (compare with claim 1 *"storing the content entities within the data repository as a plurality of file objects, each containing a content entity, wherein the content entity identifiers each include identification information identifying the content file object containing the content entity associated with that identifier."*).

In regard to dependent claim 2, ezWriter teaches content entities in the form of .rtf files. The outline in ezWriter's left pane reflect the hierarchical structure of the set of said .rtf files. A user specifies said hierarchical structure (user specification) by editing the corresponding .ezw file in Notepad (ezWriter pages 9-11).

In regard to dependent claim 3, ezWriter teaches a user interface in communication with files on a storage (typically a hard drive). EzWriter allows editing (moving) of rtf files via the use of Notepad within ezWriter (ezWriter pages 8-11). EzWriter also teaches a planned improvement of allowing modification of the outline without having to edit the source file (ezWriter page 12, bullet 5).

In regard to independent claim 4, claim 4 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

EzWriter teaches a hierarchically structured outline window display of related .rtf files (ezWriter page 4; compare with claim 4 *"hierarchically structured"*).

EzWriter does not specifically teach parent and child containers adhering to inheritance, with said containers containing content entities. However, Bromberg teaches Acappella Designer, encompassing a topic hierarchy, and a display for displaying questions, etc. related to each topic (Bromberg Abstract, column 5 lines

Art Unit: 2176

27-35, column 16 lines 13-18). The designer uses a process called “rollup” which the premise that each container (parent container) in the hierarchy contains information on the activity of the containers that are subordinate to it (child containers), said containers containing content (i.e. questions, etc.). Bromberg also teaches a hierarchical table (Bromberg column 18 lines 40-65, see also column 17 lines 27-40, column 19 lines 10-20 and 22-34) (compare with claim 4 “*wherein the hierarchically related content entities....can contain content entities*”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bromberg to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of hierarchical containers within its set of files making set wide edits, etc. possible.

In regard to dependent claim 5, ezWriter teaches content entities in the form of .rtf files. The outline in ezWriter’s left pane reflect the hierarchical structure of the set of said .rtf files. A user specifies said hierarchical structure (user specification) by editing the corresponding .ezw file in Notepad (ezWriter pages 9-11).

In regard to dependent claim 6, ezWriter teaches a user interface in communication with files on a storage (typically a hard drive). EzWriter allows editing (moving) of rtf files via the use of Notepad within ezWriter (ezWriter pages 8-11). EzWriter also teaches a planned improvement of allowing modification of the outline without having to edit the source file (ezWriter page 12, bullet 5).

In regard to dependent claim 7, ezWriter teaches that its invention is to assist with the organization of outlines, concepts, notes, and chapters. The author (a Science-Fiction writer), used said invention to maintain files associated with a Science-Fiction Trilogy (ezWriter page 3).

In regard to dependent claim 22, EzWriter does not specifically teach calculating costs. However, Bromberg teaches “rollup” which calculates a cost of a question (true/false, etc.), and propagates said cost up the

Art Unit: 2176

tree, depending upon the costs of the elements within the child containers (Bromberg column 18 lines 40-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bromberg to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of analyzing costs of various questions answered in a prepared questionnaire, or textbook, etc. created by EzWriter.

In regard to dependent claim 23, EzWriter does not specifically teach calculating costs. However, Bromberg teaches “rollup” which calculates a cost of a question (true/false, etc.), and propagates said cost up the tree, depending upon the costs of the elements within the child containers (Bromberg column 18 lines 40-65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bromberg to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of analyzing costs of various questions answered in a prepared questionnaire, or textbook, etc. created by EzWriter.

In regard to claims 8-10, 24, claims 8-10, 24 reflect the program storage device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 1-3, 22, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 11-14, 25, claims 11-14, 25 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 4-7, 23, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 15-17, 26, claims 15-17, 26 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 1-3, 22, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to claims 18-21, 27, claims 18-21, 27 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 4-7, 23, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to independent claim 40, claim 40 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

EzWriter teaches an index file (.ezw) which keeps a list of each .rtf file. (ezWriter page 10). The user movement of one file to another location in said index file defines the hierarchical file position relative to all other files. Hierarchical presentation of ezWriter (combined with Bromberg's containers etc.) teaches that the destination of a moved .rtf file results in said .rtf file becoming a child of its parent file (i.e. the hierarchical listing can be broken down into a number of related sub-lists, or branches) (compare with claim 40 "*wherein moving a content entity identifier in the first list to a new location comprises: selecting the content entity identifier from the first list of content entity identifiers to be moved; and specifying a location from a second list of content entity identifiers where the content entity identifier from the first list of content entity identifiers is to be moved; wherein the specified location comprises at least one of a current content entity identifier or a newly created content entity identifier.*").

In regard to dependent claim 41, ezWriter teaches selection of a destination content entity (a sub-list or branch, as explained in the rejection of claim 40). The index file used for user manipulation (ezWriter Figure 10) is obtained via Outline, Edit option of a drop down menu (ezWriter page 8, bottom section).

In regard to independent claim 42, claim 42 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 40, and in further view of the following, is rejected along the same rationale.

EzWriter does not specifically teach a database. However, Bromberg teaches association with databases (Bromberg Figure 3, column 19 lines 44-46; compare with claim 42 "*a computer database*"). It would have

Art Unit: 2176

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Bromberg to ezWriter, providing ezWriter the benefit of database to facilitate a more orderly and efficient arrangement of stored data.

In regard to dependent claim 43, claim 43 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 41, and is rejected along the same rationale.

8. **Claims 28-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over ezWriter and Bromberg, as applied to claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, 18, above, and further in view of Poole et al. (hereinafter Poole), U.S. Patent No. 6,006,242 issued December 1999 (cited in Applicant's IDS).**

In regard to dependent claim 28, EzWriter does not specifically teach an identifier with a format as claimed in claim 28. However, Poole teaches dynamically creating a document comprising a Parties business object, said object containing a number of sub-objects and items: "Parties.Items(1).Type" (Poole column 36 lines 18-23, 39-40, 43), can be interpreted as parent container/child container/content entity, exhibiting inheritance within a hierarchical system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Poole to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of a struct oriented implementation for more efficient programming (i.e. C, C++, Java, etc.).

In regard to dependent claim 29, ezWriter teaches that its invention is to assist with the organization 4 of outlines, concepts, notes, and chapters. Since EzWriter teaches that the author used said invention to maintain files associated with a Science-Fiction Trilogy (ezWriter page 3), said book typically containing chapters and sections, therefore the typical parts of said book can be fairly interpreted as fitting into the containers as taught by ezWriter, Bromberg, and Poole.

In regard to dependent claim 30, EzWriter does not specifically teach an identifier with a format as claimed in claim 28. However, Poole teaches dynamically creating a document comprising a Parties business object, said object containing a number of sub-objects and items: "Parties.Items(1).Type" (Poole column 36 lines 18-23, 39-40, 43), can be interpreted as parent container/child container/content entity, exhibiting inheritance within a hierarchical system. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Poole to EzWriter, providing EzWriter the benefit of a struct oriented implementation for more efficient programming (i.e. C, C++, Java, etc.).

In regard to dependent claim 31, ezWriter teaches that its invention is to assist with the organization of outlines, concepts, notes, and chapters. Since EzWriter teaches that the author used said invention to maintain files associated with a Science-Fiction Trilogy (ezWriter page 3), said book typically containing chapters and sections, therefore the typical parts of said book can be fairly interpreted as fitting into the containers as taught by ezWriter, Bromberg, and Poole.

In regard to dependent claims 32, 33, claims 32, 33 reflect the program storage device comprising computer executable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 28, 29, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 34, 35, claims 34, 35 incorporate substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 30, 31, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 36, 37, claims 36, 37 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 28, 29, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2176

In regard to dependent claims 38, 39, claims 38, 39 reflect the system comprising computer readable instructions used for performing the method steps as claimed in claims 30, 31, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant presents no argument(s) on the merits, therefore no examiner response is deemed necessary at the present time.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 1:00pm - 9:30pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

January 6, 2007